DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 241 214 RC 014 617

AUTHOR Leon, David J.
TITLE Hispanics and the Extended Opportunity Programs and Services in California Community Colleges.
PUB DATE May 80
NOTE 14p.; Paper presented at the Southeast Conference on Education of Hispanics (Miami, FL, May 7-9, 1980).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; Administrator Characteristics; Advisory Committees; Blacks; Citizen Participation; College Administration; College Environment; College Faculty; *College Students; *Community Colleges; Educational Opportunities; *Educational Strategies; *Hispanic Americans; Low Income; *Minority Groups; Population Trends; Program Costs; Program Descriptions; Student Recruitment; Two Year Colleges; Whites
IDENTIFIERS *California; *Extended Opportunity Programs and Services

ABSTRACT

A preliminary examination of Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) in California's 107 community colleges was conducted by requesting information on individual programs; 87 responses were received. EOPS programs were established by the California Legislature in 1968 to recruit high-risk minority and low-income students and provide them with financial assistance, peer and professional counseling, tutoring, and other services to help them succeed at community colleges and perhaps transfer to 4-year colleges or universities. In 1976, 70% of EOPS students cmae from minority backgrounds; 33% were Hispanic and 30% Black. The EOPS study resulted in identification of five key variables: program leadership/philosophy, organizational structure, college environment, faculty input, and community influence. The majority of EOPS directors have at least postgraduate work or master's degrees; Hispanics represent the largest group of EOPS directors, followed by Blacks and Whites. EOPS organizational structures demonstrate either self-determination (separate entities with their own financial aid and academic and personnel support services) or integration (EOPS students integrated with the regular student population). Research indicates that supportive college environments enhance academic performance of minority students. Faculty on some campuses is more actively involved than on others. EOPS advisory committees, composed of students, faculty, administrators, and community people, vary in their degree of activity. (MH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED241214

HISPANICS AND THE EXTENDED OPPORTUNITY PROGRAMS AND SERVICES IN CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGES

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

David J. Leon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

David J. Leon

Program Coordinator/Scholar-in-Residence
Minorities and Women Project
Mexican American Legal Defense & Educational Fund
San Francisco

Assistant Professor
School of Education
UC Berkeley

Paper presented at the Southeast Conference on Education of Hispanics, Miami, Florida, May 7-9, 1980. I gratefully acknowledge aid from the National Institute of Education's Minority and Women Project.

RC014617

Hispanics and the Extended Opportunity Programs
and Services in California Community Colleges

Introduction

Public institutions of higher education in California currently face two serious and pressing problems, namely, fiscal cutbacks coupled with a drop in student enrollments. Patrick Callan, director of California's Post-secondary Education Commission (CPEC), offers a solution which will effect both problems. He urges colleges and universities to actively seek the recruitment and enhance the retention of minority students or they will suffer a drastic decline in their enrollments by a third or more in the next decade. This strategy is consistent with both the changing racial composition of the public school population and the dramatic growth of minorities in the state.

Public officials are thus faced with important social policy issues. Is it possible for public institutions of higher education to increase their representation of minorities on their campuses? How can it be done given their fiscal problems? What models exist for the recruitment and retention of minority students? An examination of Extended Opportunity Programs and Services (EOPS) in California's community college system may shed some light on the problems and prospects of minorities in higher education, and on the future of public higher education in general.

California's Changing Population

A recent report indicates that the minority population will double by the year 2000. This dramatic increase of minorities in the coming years necessitates public officials to closely examine how institutions can best meet their educational needs.

Table 1

Minority Population as Percent of Total Population in California

1970	1977	1984	1990
22.8%	33.4%	44.1%	53.2%

Source: Office of the Lieutenant Governor, Council on Intergroup Relations, 1978.

The largest minority segment to increase is the Hispanic population. This group has nearly doubled in the last seven years. Additionally, the per-

Table II

Relative Proportions of Minority Groups in California, 1970-1977

	1970		1977	
Group	Number	%	Number	%
White	15,475,054	77.2	16,883,284	66.7
Hispanic	2,369,292	11.8	5,166,300	20.3
Black	1,442,508	7.2	1,645,000	6.4
Other	739,964	3.8	1,670,000	6.6
Total	20,026,818	100.00	25,364,584	100.00

Source: Office of the California State Superintendant of Schools, 1978.

centage of minority students in the public schools (K-12) has increased from one-fourth to more than one-third in the past ten years. It is also estimated that they will constitute the majority population by the year 2000.

Table III

Minority and White Student Population in California Public Schools, 1967-1977

1967		1977
Group	% of Total	% of Total
Whites	75.0	63.5
Hispanics	12.1	21.0
Blacks	8.4	10.0
Others	4.5	5.5
Total	100.0	100.0

As the President of the State Board of Education, Professor Michael Kirst of Stanford University remarked: "The very high leap in the Hispanic student population is the thing that stands out." In the past ten years, Hispanics have increased from 616,226 to 892,113, making them the largest minority group in the state's public school system. Further, while the median age of whites is growing older, that of Hispanics -- currently 20 years old -- is expected to remain quite young for the next 25 years. Thus, Hispanics could potentially occupy a greater and greater proportion of our university classrooms in the future.

Public Higher Education

Public higher education in California is characterized by a three-tier system of community colleges, state colleges and universities (CSUC), and the University of California (UC). Approximately 1,400,000 students are enrolled in these postsecondary institutions: 70% are enrolled in community colleges, 20% in the state colleges and universities, and 8% in the University of California (cf. CPEC, 1970). These percentages reflect the different admissions requirements of each system: community colleges operate with an open door philosophy; state colleges and universities enroll the top 25% of high school graduates; and the University of California selectively accepts the top 12-1/2 % of high school graduates. This publicly supported system of higher education enables residents the opportunity for postsecondary training regardless of previous academic background.

Since the 107 community colleges have liberal admissions requirements, minimal fees, and are easily accessible in virtually all regions of the state, they attract a substantial number of minority students. Of the total number of black and Hispanic students enrolled in public postsecondary education,

89.5% were in the community colleges, 6.7% in the CSUC, and 3.8% in the UC system (cf. California Legislature, 1979). These figures indicate that there is a greater proportional representation of Hispanics and other minorities in the two-year colleges than in the two remaining four-year systems. The data is consistent with minority representation in higher education across the nation (cf. Olivas, 1979; Karabel, 1972).

The most obvious disparity between institutional and comparison group figures among ethnic groups is with Hispanics. They represent 21% of the K-12 student population, yet only constitute 9% of the community college students, 6% of the state college and university population, and 5.4% of the University of California undergraduates. Thus, all three systems exhibit a significant underrepresentation of Hispanics.

Statement of the Problem

Since Hispanics are largely represented in two-year colleges, this research focuses on the following questions: what kinds of programs in community colleges best serve the educational needs of Hispanics and other minorities? Are there models that can be followed? If so, what theories provide workable suggestions to meet the needs of minorities? Examination of EOPS programs may provide insights into the future of minorities in higher education.

EOPS in California Community Colleges

EOPS programs in California community colleges were established by Senate Bill 164, passed in 1968 which mandated four major educational objectives:

1. "Community colleges should recognize the need and accept the responsibility for extending the opportunities for community college education to all who may profit therefrom regardless of economic, social and educational status."

2. "Community colleges should establish and develop services directed to the identification of potential students affected by language, social and economic disadvantages."

3. "Community colleges should establish and develop services, techniques and activities directed to the recruitment and retention of such students (to the completion of their educational goals)."

4. "Community colleges should establish services, techniques and activities directed to stimulating such students' interest in intellectual, educational and vocational attainment." (Bridge the Gap, 1976)

EOPS programs were thus established to recruit high risk minority and low income students and provide them with financial assistance, peer and professional counseling, tutoring and other services in an effort to help them succeed at the community college, and hopefully, transfer to a four-year college or university.

EOPS programs receive their funding from state sources. The monies are divided into four general areas: administration, direct grants to students, supportive services, and special programs.

Table IV

EOPS Funding and Students Served

	Actual 1978-79	Estimated 1979-80	Proposed 1980-81
1. Administration....	$1,388,920	$1,562,642	$1,614,704
2. Grants.....	7,912,449	9,297,300	10,619,857
3. Services.....	7,738,550	9,221,489	10,552,461
4. Special projects..	350,000	390,661	409,058
Totals.....	$17,389,919	$20,472,092	$23,196,080
Students served...	57,392	64,391	67,890

Source: California Legislative Analysis Office, 1980.

The main criteria for acceptance into EOPS programs is economic disadvantage status. The regulation reads: "The family's (student's parents or legal guardians) previous year's gross income shall not exceed $8,250 for a family of four with an additional $900 for each additional dependent."

EOPS students were found in 1976 to differ significantly from other com-

munity college students on one important variable - ethnic identification. 70% of EOP students came from minority backgrounds, and 28% were whites. This compares to 35% minority/61% white among regular community college students. The largest proportions of EOPS students are Hispanic (33%) followed by blacks (30%), whites (28%) and others (9%).

Data Collection

This exploratory study is divided into three stages: initial contact and feedback; questionnaire construction and administration; and analysis of findings. At this point, the first stage has been completed.

Contact has been made with EOPS directors at all community college campuses. Letters requesting descriptive information on the individual programs were sent. Eighty-seven responses were received - a 63% rate of return. As can be noted in Figure 1, a diverse cross section of community colleges from urban/rural areas have responded.

Preliminary Data Analysis

An analysis of information received through the mail and via phone conversations with EOPS directors resulted in the identification of five key variables:

1. Program leadership and philosophy
2. Organizational structure of the program
3. College environment
4. Faculty input
5. Community influence

These variables will form the basis of a questionnaire to be sent to EOPS directors at a later date.

Program Leadership and Philosophy

This variable will describe and analyze the different management styles

Figure 1

CALIFORNIA COMMUNITY COLLEGE CAMPUSES

[Underline designates those institutions that have responded.]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

of EOPS directors and their philosophy of education regarding minorities in higher education. Information regarding educational background, experience, duties and responsibilities, may determine what effect, if any, they have on the recruitment and retention of Hispanic students.

Some research in this area has already been completed. Their educational background has been reported indicating that the majority have at least post-graduate work or master's degrees.

Table V

Educational Level of EOPS Directors

Educational Level	EOPS Directors
Bachelor's Degree	10
Some Graduate Work	13
Master's Degree	62
Doctorate or Professional Degree (Ph.D., M.D., LL.B, etc)	14
	99

Source: Farland et al., 1976.

EOPS directors generally represent one of the minority groups they serve.

Table VI

EOPS Directors' Minority/Majority Background

Racial or Ethnic Group	EOPS Director
American Indian/Native American	2
Asian American/Oriental	3
Black/Negro	37
White/Caucasian	14
Spanish Surname	41
Mexican American/Chicano	(35)
Puerto Rican	(2)
Other	(4)
Other	3
Total	110

Hispanics represent the largest group of EOPS directors followed by blacks and whites.

The second variable mentioned, duties and responsibilities of EOPS directors, was examined by the 1976 study in terms of the amount of time devoted to program development. This table indicates that less than one-

Table VII

Percentage of EOPS Directors' Workload

Proportion of Time	%
Full-time responsibilities	31
More than 3/4 time responsibilities	15
1/2 to 3/4 time responsibilities	28
Less than 1/2 time responsibilities	27

third of EOPS Directors devote their full time energies to the program. Ostensibly, this would appear to have a negative affect on the quality of the program. However, several EOPS directors have noted positive aspects. For example, in one particular case, an EOPS director pointed out that his program is well-established and accepted on campus because he has other administrative responsibilities to perform. He is a proven administrator and has the respect of the faculty and administration.

Organizational Structure

Two organizational structures of EOPS programs have been identified: self-determination and integration. The models in question are dependent to a large extent on the philosophy of the EOPS director. The self-determination model argues that minority students require special services apart from the regular campus facilities because their needs require careful and sensitive attention. Many of the early programs were envisioned by the minority pathfinders as separate and special entities which would have a full complement of financial aid and academic and personal support services. As EOPS programs evolved statewide from 1968 to 1976, an integration model appeared.

Supporters of this model argued that EOPS students should be integrated with the regular student population so that they do not feel "different" or "special."

College Environment

Although EOPS programs were established on most community college campuses between 1969 to 1976, some institutions had supportive services for minority students prior to that time. Interviews with EOPS directors indicate that in some cases their programs have gained acceptance and recognition, whereas others are still struggling for legitimacy. How do these two types of environments affect the performance of EOPS students on the various campuses? Recent research on college environments indicates that a supportive one helps to enhance academic performance of minority students (cf. Gurin, 1966; Klingelhofer & Hollander, 1973; Leon, 1979; Sedlacek & Brooks, 1976).

Faculty Input

To what extent is the faculty involved in EOPS programs? Since the faculty and administration govern the campus, it is therefore imperative to measure their contribution. On some campuses, the faculty is actively involved, whereas on others the level of participation is not quite as high. How does this activity affect the growth and development of EOPS programs?

Community Influence

EOPS programs are mandated by law to establish and maintain an advisory committee composed of students, faculty, administrators and community people. These committees can be an important voice in the determination of the program's goals as well as provide important political pressure when necessary. However, some advisory committees are much more active than others. To what extent does this committee help to build and maintain program strength?

Conclusion

Examination of these variables will hopefully lead to the development of model programs for Hispanics and other minorities in California's community colleges. This is an important effort since the future of minorities depends to a large extent on their access to and success in our educational institutions.

REFERENCES

Bridge the Gap
1976 "Summary of report on EOPS in California community colleges." Special edition, August.

California Legislature
1979 Increasing the rate and retention of community college transfers from underrepresented groups. Sacramento, CA: Staff Report.

California Postsecondary Education Commission
1979 Information digest 1979. Sacramento, CA: California Postsecondary Education Commission.

Farland, Ronald; Clare Rose; Glenn Nyre; James Trent
1976 The study of extended opportunity programs and services in California community colleges. Sacramento, CA: The Board of Governors, California Community Colleges.

Gurin, Patricia
1966 Motivation and aspiration in the Negro college. Ann Arbor: Survey Research Center, University of Michigan.

Karabel, Jerome
1972 "Community colleges and social stratification." Harvard Educational Review 42 (November): 521-562.

Klingelhofer, E. and L. Hollander
1973 Educational characteristics and needs of new students. University of California, Berkeley: Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.

Leon, David
1979 "Institutional racism and the educational opportunity program: a study of organizational change and strategies for reform." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association, Boston, September.

Olivas, Michael
1979 The dilemma of access. Washington, D.C.: Howard University Press.

Sedlacek, William and G. Brooks
1976 Racism in American education: a model for change. Chicago, Nelson-Hall.